

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 18, 20, 21, 24-34 and Claims 36 and 37 are active in the case. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to a method of producing light polarizing films.

Claim Amendments

Claims 18, 36 and 37 have been amended limiting the ratio of A/B to a maximum of three as supported by the specification in the first full paragraph on page 7 of the text. The remaining amendments to the claims replace the initials of "PVA" with its full meaning of "polyvinyl alcohol." None of the amendment introduce new matter into the case. Entry of the amended claims into the record is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 18-21, 24-34, 36 and 37 stand rejected based on 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Racich et al, U. S. Patent 4,591,512 in view of Sanefuji et al, U. S. Patent Publication 2002/0001700. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

The arguments as previously advanced by applicants on the record are maintained. However, as is clear from the amendment made to each of Claims 18, 36 and 37, the present claims are now narrower than previously presented with respect to the time of immersion of the stained PVA film in the borating bath. As disclosed at column 4, lines 24 to 30 of the Racich et al patent, *the sheet enters the solution at a speed of about 0.3 m/min and leaves at a speed of 0.42 m/min with the immersion time being about 3.4 min.* This time of immersion disclosed by Racich et al corresponds to the A/B ratio of the present claims which is now defined as a maximum of 3.0 min to a minimum of 0.5 min. Thus, it is clear that the 3.4 min time disclosed by Racich et al is greater than and outside the range of time of the A/B ratio of

the present claims. There is nothing in the patent that would suggest the stretching of a PVA film in a borating bath for a time of 3 min or less. Thus, the present claims are further distinguished over the Racich et al patent.

As to the Sanefuji et al patent, paragraph [0030] describes a PVA film that has a width of at least 2 m, and that this film is subjected to dyeing, monoaxial stretching, a fixing treatment and a drying treatment. The film can be subjected to a wet stretching process and can be treated in hot water. The film is stretched to a stretching ratio of at least 5 times. As disclosed in paragraph [0031], boric acid is normally added to the stretching bath. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in the reference of parameters A, B, C and A/B of the present claims. In other words, there is nothing in the disclosure of Sanefuji et al that would suggest a stretching distance (A) of at least 5 (m), a stretched film speed (B) (m/min) and a stretched film width (C), wherein the ratio A/B ranges from a maximum of 3 min to a minimum of 0.5 min and the A/C ratio is at least 5. Accordingly, the combined teachings of the patent do not suggest the present claims and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner in the outstanding Office Action has spoken of simple adjustment of processing parameters to allow for a greater width of film, and that it simply be a matter of “scaling-up” parameters such as the stretching distance and the ratio of the stretching distance to the stretched film width. However, if such a scale-up was performed, not only the value of A would increase, but also the value of the ratio A/B would increase further beyond the upper limit expressed in the claims. Thus, “scaling-up” parameters will not bring the prior art closer to the present invention.

Appln. No. 10/691,573
Reply to the Office Action of January 3, 2008

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Customer Number

22850

Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax. (703) 413-2220

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "FD Vastine", written over a horizontal line.

Frederick D. Vastine
Registration No. 27,013